

Argument in Favor of Proposition 73

IN CALIFORNIA, a daughter under 18 can't get an aspirin from the school nurse, get a flu shot, or have a tooth pulled without a parent knowing.

HOWEVER, surgical or chemical abortions can be secretly performed on minor girls—even *13 years old or younger—without parents' knowledge.*

PARENTS are then not prepared to help young daughters with any of the serious physical, emotional, or psychological complications which may result from an abortion or to protect their daughters from further sexual exploitation and pregnancies.

A study of over 46,000 pregnancies of school-age girls in California found that *over two-thirds* were impregnated by adult men whose mean age was 22.6 years.

Investigations have shown that secret abortions on minors in California are rarely reported to child protective services although these pregnancies are evidence of statutory rape and sexual abuse. This leaves these girls *vulnerable* to further sexual abuse, rapes, pregnancies, abortions, and sexually transmitted diseases.

That's why *more than ONE MILLION SIGNATURES* were submitted to allow Californians to *vote* on the "Parents' Right to Know and Child Protection" Proposition 73.

PROP. 73 will require that one parent or guardian be notified at least 48 hours before an abortion is performed on a minor daughter.

PARENTS AND DAUGHTERS in more than 30 other states have benefited for years from laws like Prop. 73. Many times, after such laws pass, there have been substantial reductions in pregnancies and abortions among minors.

When parents are involved and minors cannot anticipate secret access to free abortions they more often avoid the reckless behavior which leads to pregnancies. Older men, including Internet predators, are deterred from

impregnating minors when secret abortions are not available to conceal their crimes.

If she chooses, a minor may petition juvenile court to permit an abortion without notifying a parent. She can request a lawyer to help her. If the evidence shows she is mature enough to decide for herself or that notifying a parent is not in her best interests, the judge will grant her petition. The proceedings must be confidential, prompt, and free. She may also seek help from juvenile court if she is being coerced by anyone to consent to an abortion.

POLLS SHOW most people support parental notification laws. They know that a minor girl—pregnant, scared, and possibly abandoned or pressured by an older boyfriend—needs the advice and support of a *parent*.

PARENTS have invested more attention and love in raising their daughter, know her personal and medical history better, and care more about her future than strangers employed by abortion clinics profiting from performing many abortions on minors.

A minor still has a right to obtain or refuse an abortion, but a parent can help her understand all options, obtain competent care, and provide medical records and history.

An informed parent can also get prompt care for *hemorrhage, infections*, and other possibly *fatal* complications.

Vote "YES" on PROP. 73 TO ALLOW PARENTS TO CARE FOR AND PROTECT THEIR MINOR DAUGHTERS!

www.YESon73.net

WILLIAM P. CLARK, California Supreme Court Justice, 1973–1981

MARY L. DAVENPORT, M.D., Fellow of the American College of Obstetricians and Gynecologists

MARIA GUADALUPE GARCIA, Organizing Director Parents' Right to Know and Child Protection/YES ON 73

Rebuttal to Argument in Favor of Proposition 73

KEEPING TEENS SAFE IS A PRIMARY CONCERN TO PARENTS, BUT Prop. 73's proponents believe government can force teens to communicate with their parents. Who's kidding who? FAMILY COMMUNICATION CAN'T BE "REQUIRED" BY GOVERNMENT. Talking to our daughters about responsible sexual behavior when they're young is the best way to protect them.

In fact, MOST TEENS DO TALK TO THEIR PARENTS, BUT SOME JUST CAN'T *SAFELY*. Proponents are *wrong* when they say those teens can *easily go to court*. IT'S UNREASONABLE TO EXPECT VULNERABLE, SCARED TEENAGERS FROM ABUSIVE FAMILIES TO SIMPLY "GO TO COURT." California courthouses are crowded; these teens don't need to endure a court proceeding.

The proponents are *wrong* when they assert that Internet predators and statutory rapists will be deterred from their despicable actions by new laws like these. THAT'S PREPOSTEROUS—it's just included to scare voters.

What proponents don't tell you is this law FORCES DOCTORS TO REPORT these procedures TO THE GOVERNMENT—why does government need to know?

They've also slipped into their initiative language adding "unborn child, a child conceived but not born" to our Constitution. What does that have to do with notification? We don't know.

What we do know is that THE CALIFORNIA SUPREME COURT, looking at the experience of other states with similar laws, CONCLUDED THAT THE EVIDENCE "OVERWHELMINGLY" SHOWS THESE LAWS DO NOT SUPPORT FAMILIES, BUT IN FACT, PUT TEENAGERS IN DANGER.

California's League of Women Voters, medical experts, and millions of concerned parents urge you to VOTE NO.

Visit *www.NoOnProposition73.org*.

DEBORAH BURGER, RN, President California Nurses Association

KATHY KNEER, CEO Planned Parenthood Affiliates of California

A. ERIC RAMOS, M.D., President California Academy of Family Physicians